



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,192	01/17/2002	Samuel I. Brandt	2002P00448 US	8677

7590 01/10/2008

Elsa Keller
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

LE, LINH GIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,192

Applicant(s)

BRANDT ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle Linh-Giang Le

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 26 September 2007.

Claims 1-24 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Brown (6458080) in view of Du (6,078,982).
4. As per claim 1, Brown teaches a system for scheduling a set of tasks to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery, a method for providing a user interface for processing an event representing a change in circumstances potentially affecting healthcare delivered to a patient (Brown; Col. 6 "Health History" and Col. 7, "

in response to user command, initiating generation of at least one display image supporting a user in (Brown; Col. 6, lines 4-12),
identifying an event and an associated parameter (Brown; Col. 6, lines 13-30);
designating a predetermined first process is associated with said event by
associating identifiers with said event and said associated parameter, said
predetermined process comprising a set of tasks to be performed by at least one
individual to support healthcare delivery ("scheduled tasks" read on
"predetermined first process") (Brown; Col. 7, lines 35-47)
providing said associated parameter to said first process using a map in at least
one repository associating event identifiers and parameter identifiers (Brown;
Col. 9, lines 18-40).

Brown does not expressly teach: identifying a global parameter;
designating a plurality of predetermined concurrently operable processes,
including said first process, are associated with said global parameter for
concurrently automatically sharing a value of said global parameter; and
indicating a value of said associated parameter is to be provided to said first
process in response to occurrence of said event; enabling access by said
predetermined concurrently operable processes and sharing of said global
parameter value. However these features are well known in the art as evidenced
by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and
concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9
teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "global parameter")
in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been

obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

20. As per claim 2, Brown does not expressly teach including the step of: filtering messages identifying events using said map to exclude messages conveying event identifiers unassociated with said predetermined first process from being passed to said process, wherein said at least one display image supports and designating an executable procedure, for initiating a workflow process comprising a sequence of tasks to be performed by a worker or system, is associated with said event and wherein execution of said procedure is initiated in response to occurrence of said event.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9 teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "global parameter") in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

5. As per claim 3, Brown teaches wherein said at least one display image supports designating a second process, comprising a scheduled sequence of tasks to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery, is

associated with said event and

determining said second process is to be at least one of, (a) replaced and (b) supplemented, by said predetermined first process in response to occurrence of said event (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

6. As per claim 4, Brown (Col. 9, lines 18-40) teaches wherein said second process is supplemented by said predetermined first process by at least one of the steps of,

- (a) adding said tasks of said predetermined first process to tasks of said second process, and
- (b) substituting at least one of said tasks of said predetermined first process for a task of said second process.

7. As per claim 5, Brown teaches wherein said at least one display image supports designating a second process is to be at least one of, (a) replaced and (b) supplemented, by said predetermined first process in response to occurrence of said event, said second process comprising a scheduled sequence of tasks to be performed by at least one individual to support healthcare delivery and is different to said predetermined first process sequence of tasks (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

8. As per claim 6, Brown does not expressly teach wherein said at least one display image supports designating predetermined parameter verification criteria is associated with said associated parameter.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9 teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "parameter verification criteria") in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

9. As per claim 7, Brown does not expressly teach wherein said designated predetermined parameter verification criteria comprises at least one of, (a) a value range (b) a value type and (c) a parameter symbol check.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9 teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "parameter verification criteria") in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

10. As per claim 8, Brown does not expressly teach wherein said plurality of predetermined concurrently operable processes comprise process instances.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9 teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "parameter verification criteria") in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

11. As per claim 9, Brown does not expressly teach wherein said step of designating said predetermined first process is associated with said event comprises designating an instance of said predetermined first process is associated with said event.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). Du Fig. 9 teaches data shared between two different nodes (reads on "parameter verification criteria") in order for various processes to be run concurrently. It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

21. As per claim 10, Brown does not expressly teach including the step of searching a database containing records indicating active processes to identify active process instances of said predetermined first process. However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

12. As per claim 11, Brown does not expressly teach including the step of in response to user command via said at least one display image, storing at least one of, (a) an event identifier identifying said event, (b) a process identifier identifying said predetermined first process and (c) an identifier identifying a particular instance of said predetermined first process.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

13. As per claim 12, Brown teaches wherein said event comprises at least one of, (a) an event resulting from action by healthcare personnel, (b) an event

generated by an operating process, (c) an event generated by patient monitoring equipment and (d) an event generated by a medical device (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

14. As per claim 13, Brown does not expressly teach wherein said display image indicates to a user a mapping of a first label representing said event associated parameter used by said predetermined first process to a corresponding second label representing said associated parameter used by a second process replaceable by said predetermined first process upon occurrence of said event.

However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

15. As per claim 14 Brown does not expressly teach wherein said first label is different from said second label. However these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Du. Du teaches a pre-locking coordination scheme to ensure consistent and concurrent execution of a workflow process (Du; Col. 9, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to add these features to Brown with the

motivation of allowing for a high degree of concurrency and consistency in a workflow process.

16. As per claim 15, Brown teaches wherein said at least one display image indicates individual tasks comprising said predetermined first process (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

17. As per claim 16, Brown teaches wherein said at least one display image supports user designation of a particular individual task of said individual tasks and said predetermined first process is initiated from said user designated particular individual task upon occurrence of said event (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

18. As per claim 17, Brown teaches wherein upon occurrence of said event, said predetermined first process omits at least one task prior to said designated particular individual task (Brown; Col. 9, lines 18-40).

22. Claims 18-24 repeat the limitations of claims 1-17 and the reasons for rejection are incorporated herein.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Linh-Giang Le whose telephone

Application/Control Number:
10/052,192
Art Unit: 3626


Page 11

number is 571-272-8207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 5PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-3600. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LLe


ROBERT W. MORGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600